

The Sun

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1914.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month..... \$5 00
DAILY, Per Year..... 50 00
SUNDAY, Per Month..... 25 00
SUNDAY, Per Year..... 250 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... 8 50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... 85 00

FOREIGN RATES.
DAILY, Per Month..... 1 25
DAILY, Per Year..... 12 50
SUNDAY, Per Month..... 65 00
SUNDAY, Per Year..... 650 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... 1 90
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... 19 00

THE EVENING SUN, Per Month..... 25 00
THE EVENING SUN, Per Year..... 250 00
THE EVENING SUN (Foreign), Per Mo. 1 00

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer, William C. Reick, 170 Nassau street, New York. President, Edward C. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Secretary, C. E. Linton, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Edinburgh House, 1 Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4, England.

Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodiere, au Rue du Quatre Septembre.

Washington office, Illinois Building, Brookline office, 190 Livingston street.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Admiral Blue on the Unpreparedness of Our Navy.

Congress will reassemble early in December. We hope that Representative GARDNER of Massachusetts will lose no time in pressing his resolution for a commission to inquire "into the question of the preparedness of the United States for war, defensive or offensive."

So far as the condition of the navy is concerned the annual report of Rear Admiral VICTOR BLUE, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, published on Friday, confirms and reinforces the statements about the deficiencies of the service which Mr. GARDNER made in his speech near the close of the last session of Congress on October 16.

The presentation of the case by Admiral BLUE cannot be waved aside as a "mental exercise." When he says that 18,000 more sailors are needed to man the vessels of the navy now in commission or available, although the full strength of the enlistment allowed by law has been reached, the necessity of prompt legislation to fill the complement is not debatable. Furthermore, "during the coming year and a half," to quote from his report, "it is expected that eight destroyers, ten submarines, two dreadnoughts and several auxiliaries will be ready for commission." Are these ships to lie idle at the naval stations for want of crews? The answer is that for an indefinite time there is nothing else to be done, unless enough men are drafted from other ships to make a show of equipping the new ones, with the result that all of them will be short handed. It takes three years to train the enlisted man and make him a sailor fit to go into action, and we are falling behind in material and the finished product year by year.

If the navy needs men it also needs experienced officers of the higher grades. What a staggering revelation Admiral BLUE makes! A deadlock in promotion virtually exists in the navy. Of 1,881 officers of the line 793 are above the rank of junior grade lieutenant, and 1,088 are of that rank or lower. To illustrate:

"The Junior Ensigns of the class of 1915 cannot expect to be promoted to Lieutenant-Commanders, under such conditions, under forty years, or at a time when they will have reached the statutory retirement age of sixty-two. In other words, all the officers in the service fit for duty would be Junior Lieutenants and Ensigns."

All the officers of the fleet above the Junior Lieutenants would be about to retire. What a state of things when we consider that most of the Captains in the British navy are comparatively young men, in the very prime of their mental and physical powers! Admiral SIR JOHN JELlicoe, now in command of the battle fleet in the North Sea, is less than 55. Admiral DAVID BEATTY, commander of the flying squadron in the North Sea, is 43. An American naval officer has almost reached the retiring age of 62 when our Chinese system makes him a Rear Admiral. The youngest Admiral on the list in the Army and Navy Register of 1913 was 59, and most of the twenty-five Rear Admirals were 60 or over. Some even of our Captains were as old as the older Admirals, and a great many of the Captains were born before Sir JOHN JELlicoe. Now this archaic plan of promotion will have to be banished if the congestion emphasized by the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation is not to continue to the increasing detriment of the American navy.

One of the most alarming things brought out in this report is the deficiency in torpedo experts, due to the demands of the seagoing ships for officers. Representative GARDNER has drawn attention to the fact that we have far from enough torpedoes for active services, but it is even more disquieting to know that we have not enough torpedo officers for war if it

should come—and it would be a war in which the torpedo would play a large, perhaps the major, part. A school to train officers, when they can be withdrawn from fleet duties, has been established on the Montana, but Admiral BLUE intimates that the demand for torpedo officers is still much greater than the supply. At present in this branch of the naval service we are sadly deficient.

The conclusion from this illuminating report must be that the inadequacy of the navy extends to personnel, training and complement as well as to ships. Congress cannot turn a deaf ear to the demonstration. The lessons of the great conflict in Europe are written too large to be disregarded. This time Congress must act. The people must see that it does act.

Mr. Taft on Watchful Waiting.

After Mr. TAFT's retirement from the Presidency at least one member of his Cabinet intimated that Mr. TAFT, if he had been reelected, would have refused to recognize General HUERTA as provisional President of Mexico. The plain implication was that Mr. TAFT approved of his successor's policy of "watchful waiting."

This must have been a misconception of Mr. TAFT's point of view, unless in the intervening period he has changed his mind. For in an address at Montclair on Friday evening the ex-President, who dealt with the subject publicly for the first time, did not hesitate to take ground against Mr. Wilson's policy. What could be more explicit than this judgment:

"It is difficult to deny the fairness of the conclusion that in announcing to the world that we never would recognize HUERTA either as provisional President or as permanent President, in lifting the embargo on the importation of arms to enable the forces of CARRANZA and VILLA to arm themselves, and in the seizure and occupation of his chief revenue producing port of Vera Cruz, we deliberately drove HUERTA out of Mexico, and with equal deliberation brought in CARRANZA and VILLA in the expectation that they would compose the troubles of unfortunate Mexico."

Mr. TAFT's conclusion that we have neither watched nor waited, and that the "present anarchy" is a logical consequence of the much heralded policy, indicates that it never enjoyed his intelligent approval.

Is the Public Indifferent to Good Books?

Writing in the *Atlantic Monthly* on "The Reading of Books Nowadays" Mr. GEORGE P. BRETHERTON, the head in this country of a famous publishing house, concludes from various facts, from his own observations and from the success of cheap editions of certain volumes on serious themes, with the query which he modestly makes personal to himself but which has occurred to many others, "as to whether books in these days have not lost the preeminence they formerly enjoyed as the principal, and for many people the only, means of willing away pleasantly or instructively the unoccupied hours of life." He looks back to his youth in England and here in the late '90s and early '70s, days before the devil wagon, when "baseball was a real game, not a business"; when the tarantula had not stung the feet of the whole universal Yankee nation.

After he went into business the young folks his companions "were reading such books as Darwin's 'Origin of Species,' DICKENS'S 'Other Worlds Than Ours,' GREEN'S 'Short History of the English People,' and many others of a similar character." They discussed them, bought them even. The formation of libraries was encouraged by parents and was the fashion among Mr. BRETHERTON's friends. He thinks that they were not different in their tastes from other young people and from older people.

In the '50s there was a robustness in the modern habit. "Beginning about the middle of the last century we find works on popular science, such as HUGH MILLER'S 'Footprints of the Creator' and 'The Testimony of the Rocks,' in great demand; these were to be found in every household, as was also MARTIN TUPPER'S 'Proverbial Philosophy,' over 500,000 copies having been sold in the United States alone. Works on philosophy and religion were also in vogue, among them 'Christianity the Logic of Creation,' by HENRY JAMES the father, which was widely read."

We had supposed that the ideas of the older HENRY JAMES, perhaps the most brilliant and original of a famous family, never found much popular acceptance. The Tupperian craze can hardly be said to indicate any sense of literature among the devotees. Later the excellent Dr. HOLLAND's muse enraptured a large and virtuous audience. Everybody to his taste, but if our young experimenters, our futurists, blasters, pounders and voracious do not find—and probably don't want—a crowded audience, is not the standard of poetic taste much higher and more exacting than it was fifty or even twenty-five years ago?

GREEN'S "History" in its first form is much more "interesting" and "exciting" than most novels. The date (1874) brings us near that of the introduction of lawn tennis into America, the period of interscholastic football and athletics generally, the passion for exercise and outdoor life and the god of the car, who is supposed with other causes to have weaned so many well-to-do Americans from books. By the way, one of the cleverest of thinkers and writers, the late SAMUEL BUTLER, pretends to admire the British patricians because they never read.

Mr. BRETHERTON deplores, as so many librarians do, the concentration of so much of the reading habit or amusement of the community on fiction. But even here has there not been a gain? Among Mr. BRETHERTON's fellow students at the College of the City of New York there must

have been some whose tender minds, unless they were different from thousands of other boys of the '60s, were fed on the publications of Mr. BEADLE and Mr. MUNRO and "story papers." The flamboyant rhetoric of AUGUSTA J. EVANS was dear to hundreds of thousands in the '70s. No doubt each generation has its admired stuffed idols and swiftest divinities. In 1914 there is more good action, most of HARDY and MERIDITH, all of STEVENSON; for instance, than the 1870 reader had; and if there is no superlative genius, there is a much higher average. And are not novels much better? At least, they widen the imagination and improve the manners; they are the travel, the history, the poetry of most of us. Why should we not read them? Not always does APOLLO stretch his bow; and the man of tired mind and body, if he is to read, reads something easy. The monstrous load of books grows infinitely. Comparatively few in any time pore over the greatest ones, not even perhaps the great and good persons who recommend them to others. The books of our own time are the ones that we can best understand; the only ones we can fully understand. If people talk about Cardinal NEWMAN more than they read him (and he is hard to read), those of us who affect to be honest with ourselves and not set up an example to others will gratefully remember that the recreation of that subtle intellect was found in the novels of good old ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

As to the great former demand recalled by Mr. BRETHERTON for the works of DARWIN, SPENCER, HUXLEY, TYNDALL, "The Origin of Species" was an epoch making work, creating slowly a sensation and curiosity whose edge time has abated. A hundred books dealing with modifications and criticisms of DARWIN'S theories are at hand. Out of the vast SPENCER much stuffing has been knocked by the unfeeling years. HUXLEY'S clear style, controversial talents and running amuck against the theologians gave him a vogue that has faded.

Mr. BRETHERTON himself publishes many "serious" books on sociology, government, labor, taxation, trusts and what not, such as the generation he represses did not know. He publishes, or at least his house on the other side publishes, FRAZER'S "Golden Bough," a marvellous learned and an expensive book. Its third edition in many volumes was lately reviewed in THE SUN. Of Mr. H. FIELDING-HALL'S charming "Soul of a People," he says that "the sale has been limited to a few, a very few hundred copies." If that is the case the editions must have been very small, for we have never seen the first.

But Mr. BRETHERTON's competence to speak in the matter is of course much greater than any observer not a publisher can pretend to. Let him speak then, and with authority:

"Must we then blame the public for its apparent complete indifference to the best thought of the time in literature and in science? Is my publishing friend right in attributing this indifference to a too great enjoyment of the material opportunities for pastime of this age of mechanical wonder and advancement? Or have the scarce headlines of modern journalism and the short, scrappy, but interesting methods of the cheap magazines so enhanced the butterfly habit of mind that we are no longer capable of continued concentration, and have lost the power of reading books requiring serious attention?"

In spite of the sins of "modern journalism," "movies" and the motor car, may an Advocate of the Printer's Devil doubt that "complete indifference"?

The School Baths Appropriation.

It will indeed be unfortunate for this city if the Aldermanic Committee on Finance places the appropriation of \$200,000 asked by Dr. MAXWELL for the maintenance of the school baths among "the amputations without impairment of vitality" contemplated by this committee simply because Alderman CRANX had his joke on the school superintendent, who included this appropriation for bathing the children with pay for teachers. The inquiry which the committee has undertaken will, it is to be hoped, reveal the fact, pointed out by the American Association for Hygiene and Public Baths over a year ago, that there has been criminal neglect of the school baths by reason of absence of appropriation for their maintenance.

This was partly remedied last year through the energetic intervention of Dr. STITT. Enlightenment on this subject may be found by the committee in the transactions for 1913 of the association, from which we extract the following passages occurring in letters from school principals and building inspectors:

"Our baths have become a valuable means of character building and social improvement among the pupils."

"In many cases the good influence has reached into the homes."

"Whenever the baths have been closed down for lack of funds the pupils have missed them sorely."

"The most marked improvement was in the ungraded classes."

"The children go back to their class rooms more refreshed and alert for work than they would be after half an hour's exercise in the gymnasium."

Mrs. WESTWORTH has reported that:

"It was very refreshing to meet those who were awake to the vital importance of the baths as a means of character building among children."

"The condition of the children was found pitiful, their underclothing soiled and tattered, their little bodies unclean. But ere long there was marked improvement."

"Principal, attendants and children all enjoying the good work. In Public School 17, a beautiful drop-proof building, twelve showers have never been used, although the children come from the tenement districts."

"In another school the baths did not know that there were twelve guides in the school building. In Public School 65 there are fifteen showers, which are used only by the janitor."

These conditions may have been remedied since the exposure of this glaring policy. If ever there was "impairment of vitality" that demands im-

mediate remedy it is the neglect for financial reasons of the school baths, of which Dr. MAXWELL himself once said in a public address: "The usefulness from a moral and hygienic point of view of the library is small compared with the advantages that would flow from the benevolence of him who shall increase the school baths."

Indeed, it were far more wise to "amputate" some of the educational fads now in vogue, even the teaching of swimming that may save a life occasionally, than to sacrifice the enormous benefits arising from teaching the young, and by example the old also, that "cleanliness is next to godliness," and to lose the economic value of this physical betterment of the tollers.

Relief in Eviction Cases.

Mr. ISAAC N. SELIGMAN, whose generosity and willingness to aid every good cause are beyond question, is entirely right in deprecating the creation of a new machine to meet a single phase of distress, the one which comes uppermost in the district courts when cases of eviction for non-payment of rent are heard. These cases are likely to be more numerous this year than usual on account of prevailing poverty. They have a specially pitiful aspect and undoubtedly in a great number of cases deserve sympathy and practical help from the charitable.

But the help should in all cases be procured through the existing organizations, which are equipped to extend it on the best terms, wisely and economically. They have the equipment; if they lack the funds those who would be willing to subscribe to a new organization can much more economically give them the money. Besides, as Judge HOFFMAN of the Municipal Court pointed out at a recent meeting, the plan which elicits Mr. SELIGMAN'S letter has grave objections on the score of entangling the administration of justice with outside sentiment. The incorporation of the Judges who deal with the eviction cases into an eviction relief body is objectionable on obvious grounds, and, as it is unnecessary, it would be wise to abandon it.

The Colonel shows his usual discretion in absenting himself from the Progressive gathering at Chicago on Wednesday. It is almost impossible to have a bulmy time at a coroner's inquest.

Mayor MCMILLAN would "like to see all of these professional things driven off the ends of the piers into the river," which is impracticable, but 10,000 policemen and a criminal code full of laws ought to be able to do something to relieve the community.

If the fears expressed by members of the "Century" are well founded, Flanders will not much longer be a life and limb than West Washington Market.

Confidence in the usefulness of the First Lord of the Admiralty in England may have been impaired by a succession of disasters to the navy, and its flamboyant optimism may grate on the nerves of an anxious people, but it hardly seems credible that the Right Hon. WINSTON CHURCHILL is in danger of losing his official head and following Prince Louis of Battenberg, the First Sea Lord, into retirement. After all, it is the work of the First Sea Lord that counts in the direction of the navy in time of war, and there is not an abler man in England for the post than Sir JOHN FISHER.

In a way the position of First Lord corresponds to that of Secretary of the Navy in this country. The First Lord is generally a civilian and seldom a naval expert. Mr. CHURCHILL was a subaltern in the army before he won fame as an adventurous war correspondent, and he was President of the Board of Trade and Home Secretary before Mr. ASQUITH made him the head of the Admiralty. It must be obvious that if any other man had been First Lord German submarine activity would have been no less successful. Making a scapegoat of Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, as the "Century" does, would not mend matters, in fact, swapping horses at the stream might be the poorest kind of wisdom in the present state of the public mind.

The announcement that Mayor MCMILLAN has trouble in finding a man for the post of "Chief Magistrate" in Brooklyn will cause general surprise, if not incredulity. There must be at least 10,000 patriots in the borough who would be willing to sacrifice large and lucrative practices to serve the city. The Mayor should not abandon hope.

President POINCARÉ, on behalf of France, has presented a hostile military, a high distinction which General and private in the French army covet alike, to General JORIS as a mark of the nation's gratitude to its commander in chief. Despatches of even date to the bestowal upon General von HINDENBURG of the degrees of Doctor of Law, Divinity, Medicine and Philosophy by the four faculties of the University of Königsberg. Each country has its own way of honoring its soldiers.

No transatlantic voyage is worth the money nowadays without a hot chase by a German cruiser. The tales that will be told by day voyagers five years from now will not marvel.

CLARK, TRESSLER and FENIMORE Cooper out of business.

The desk of Sir WALTER SCOTT and the chair of the poet SOUTHEY are to be sold at auction in New York—haunted pieces of furniture, it might be imagined, which it were almost a desecration to use. But as a source of inspiration the board on which RICHARD OF THE LION HEART, SALADIN, QUEEN ELIZABETH and Bonnie Prince CHARLIE with all their train, MONMOUTH, ROY ROY and DANIEL DUNMONT, DIANA VERNON and JEANIE and EFFIE DEANS grew into a life more vivid than history, the four faculties of the University of Königsberg. Each country has its own way of honoring its soldiers.

Song for Dying Autumn.

Upon the pool the leaf is mirror thin,
The leafless branches seek their image there;
The frosty barberries gleam like rubies in
The crisp autumn air.

Only the mosses and the lichens shine
With a faint green light beneath the June,
Only the wind whistles through the hilly pine
Breathes its eternal rune.

Soon, like a silent wrath, will come a day
Unhindered by sun or singing streams,
When the forgetful earth will drift away
Down the white tide of dreams.

—CHAPMAN SCOTT.

CHAOS IN THE RULES OF WAR.

Great Interest in the Question of Our Responsibilities and Duties as a Party to the Conventions of The Hague.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Never was light employed for a better purpose than that which you turned on the darkness involving the present war, as evidenced in your splendid article "Chaos in the Rules of War."

It seemed incredible that men of the eminence of German statesmen could have solemnly bound themselves to certain obligations and then treated and referred to them openly as "scraps of paper." And yet, until your presentation of the facts, such seemed to be the case. Many, no doubt, like myself, felt additionally thankful yesterday for what you did to set us straight. You deserve the thanks of the entire world.

I have been a reader of THE SUN for over forty years and never knew it to fail when truth and justice were involved.
New York, November 27. R. S.

Dismissing Views From Philadelphia.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: I regret that I had not read the editorial article in THE SUN of November 25 before I came to Philadelphia. As I could have combined my answer to the two articles in the one letter.

It is a pity that so much space should have been wasted in your effort to justify the United States in her neglect to take action on the violation of the Hague treaty by Germany. While there is much truth in what you have written under the heading of "Chaos in the Rules of War," it does not alter the fact that the controversy, that is, the position taken by Judge Holt in the *Independent* as to the duty of the United States in the matter of Germany's violation of neutrality.

On August 1, Germany declared war against Russia. Note that Germany addressed an ultimatum to Belgium saying she would be treated as an enemy unless she consented to the violation of her treaty with us. On August 2, Germany addressed an ultimatum to Germany saying that unless by midnight she gave a satisfactory reply to the question asked on July 31, the United States would be bound to take all steps in her power to uphold the neutrality of Belgium and the observance of a treaty to which Germany is as much a party as ourselves.

On August 3, Germany, at 1:30 P. M., the Department of State at Washington was informed through the American Minister at Brussels and the Consul-General at Antwerp that the German forces had invaded Belgium. Note that Germany declared war on Belgium on August 2, and probably Belgium on the evening of the same day.

Therefore, dealing with the question in chronological order as stated above, you will find that neither Germany nor Belgium had declared war nor had war been declared against either of them at the time of Germany's violation of the neutrality of Belgium, and therefore, as the only treaty of neutrality which was violated, that of neutrality was Germany and Russia, Article XX of the Fifth Convention cannot be brought into the discussion of the question.

The provisions of the present convention do not apply except between the Contracting Powers, and then only if all the belligerents are parties to the convention.

The fact that at a subsequent period England and France became belligerents does not disqualify her from her legal status as the articles contained in the Fifth Convention, reading as follows:

"The territory of neutral Powers is inviolable. Belligerents are forbidden to move troops or other military forces across the territory of a neutral Power."

The fact of a neutral Power refusing to accept the belligerents' claims and to violate its neutrality cannot be regarded as a hostile act.

In violation of the neutrality of Luxembourg and Belgium as above stated Germany did violate her treaty with the United States as made under the Hague Convention of 1907.

To use the words in your editorial article of November 24:

In other words, if Judge Holt were right, it would seem our duty to make war on Germany for predicted the same result which Great Britain has declared as her cause of war. There can be no doubt of this contract responsibility for Belgium's neutrality. Germany could have carried out its policy of no middle course between the cowardly repudiation of treaty obligations and the full performance of duty at what cost to the United States? Judge Holt says that Germany has undertaken as one of the responsibilities underwriters of Belgium's neutrality.

I have just read the various comments in the first two editorial columns of THE SUN of today on the foregoing questions, and I trust that the same common sense and public spirit given to the erroneous statements in your articles of November 24 and 25 you will have the kindness to publish my letter of November 25 and this, partly by the four faculties of the University of Königsberg. Each country has its own way of honoring its soldiers.

We regret that this second letter of Mr. Durant's did not reach us in time to be published along with his first communication. The point of his first letter seems to be that although the Monroe Doctrine reservation was specifically affirmed in our ratification of Convention I, of the series of fifteen, as a fixed factor in American policy, it was not formally mentioned in the ratification of the other conventions of the series. Our reply is that the single announcement of the principle of non-interference in matters of European politics was largely sufficient. The doctrine of intervention declared at the plenary session of the conference at The Hague, on October 16, 1907, could not apply to any one convention of the series without applying to all. In this correspondent's second letter, printed above, he endeavors by means of a chronological technicality to raise the question by maintaining that when Germany invaded neutral territory of Luxembourg and Belgium France and England had not yet entered the war, and that the prohibition against the violation of neutral territory was therefore still binding. It is unnecessary to scrutinize the face of the clock to test the force of the technical plea. Clearly at the time of the German invasion, France was already a belligerent, and Serbia was not a party to Convention V.

The Earlier Guarantee of Belgian Neutrality.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: I have read with much interest your editorial articles on the "Chaos in the Rules of War" and on the matters relating to the climax of idiosyncrasy now raging in Europe, and would ask you to make clear to me and to others who are at sea. The Hague agreements or non-agreements being null and void because there is no treaty to pledge, entered into between Germany, France, England and others, by which the neutrality of Belgium and Holland was to be respected? It seems to me that I have read the terms of the secret agreement made after the Napoleonic wars. Am I right?

BROOKLYN, November 28. J. M. J.

The SUN'S remarks have no reference to any existing special treaty guaran-

teeing Belgium's neutrality or to Germany's alleged violation of the same. We are now discussing only the question of treaty responsibility as it concerns the general provisions in Convention V, of the series adopted at The Hague, and of the relation thereto of the United States Government. Our purpose is not to exonerate Germany from any blame that may attach to her Government for the violation of treaties with which the United States has nothing to do. That is another question.

Germany's Responsibility for Previous Engagements.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Are your readers to understand, with Mr. George H. Gudebrod, that your article on "Chaos in the Rules of War" was intended to convey the impression that England's failure to ratify the article in the Hague convention protecting the rights of neutral States violates her commitment that Germany's invasion of Belgium constituted a violation of treaty obligations? I for one did not understand you to mean or to imply that Germany was released from the protection of England's refusal to ratify said article. T. B. New York, November 28.

By no means. See our reply to the letter preceding this. We are not at present undertaking to shed light on the other question.

THE COURTS AND CHARITY.

Eviction Cases Best Dealt With by Existing Relief Organizations.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: I fully appreciate the honor paid to me by Justice Hartman and the other Justices in requesting me to act as treasurer of the proposed "Eviction Cases Relief Association." I fully realize the crying necessity of some action which will prevent the large number of dispossession cases. In view of the present depressed industrial situation it is probable that more cases of eviction among the poor will occur this winter than heretofore, and it is to the credit of Justice Hartman and the other Municipal Justices that they are alive to the present crisis and are endeavoring to prove helpful to the community. In bringing to the attention of the public these sad conditions, which they are alive to, convinced, actuated by the noblest motives.

My judgment and experience, however, lead me to the conviction that the best interests of the city would be subserved by the Justices bringing promptly such cases of eviction before their trial, to the attention of the organized charities of this city, such as the United Hebrew Charities, the Charity Organization Society and the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. These organizations have adequate machinery to cope promptly and intelligently with the present crisis. The task imposed on the Justices to investigate such cases of eviction would, in my opinion, result in a burdened and too complicated, and could not, in the end, prove satisfactory.

I would suggest to those interested in the problem of the eviction cases and to those who are impressed with the serious conditions that confront our community that they contribute generously to the United Hebrew Charities, the Charity Organization Society, and the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. Their contributions be used to relieve the distress of worthy families threatened with eviction. ISAAC N. SELIGMAN. New York, November 28.

GRAND OPERA HERE AND ELSEWHERE.

Signor Cleofonte Campanini Stands by Chicago.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Referring to the various reports which have appeared in the New York papers recently relative to the probability of my leaving Chicago to go to New York during this season, I beg to deny most emphatically that I have any such intention. The statements attributed to me that I believe the Chicago Grand Opera Company could have carried out its plans for the season of 1915-16.

As much as I like the city of New York and the operating public, who have always manifested a keen interest in my work, I cannot forgo the sympathy and encouragement I have received from the Chicago public during the last four years, who have always stood for and behind me, and who have always been the highest and best in art and music.

I might add that my relations with the board of directors have always been most pleasant, and there has never been any question as to the fulfillment of my contract. I shall continue to serve as general director of the company in the future. CLEOFONTE CAMPANINI, General Director Chicago Grand Opera Company. Chicago, November 26.

Hames England and Carson.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: The other evening at a dinner table in New York, the subject of England's responsibility for the war was discussed. I was asked to express myself as to whether I believed England was more responsible for the war than is generally supposed. For as much as I have listened to the English, I am inclined to believe that England has done more to bring about the war than any other country. I am, however, not a student of the subject, and I am sure that you will find many who will agree with me. I am, however, not a student of the subject, and I am sure that you will find many who will agree with me. I am, however, not a student of the subject, and I am sure that you will find many who will agree with me.

Does Everybody Eat Hot Father?
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Some of the Thanksgiving collectors for the Veterans of America in this town carried standards calling for subscriptions for the relief of the "Hungry Children." Are we to infer from this that everybody eats hot father, or that the voracity of fathers leads them to consume the entire family provender leaving nothing for mothers and children?

BOSTON, Mass., November 27. C. E. S.

Men's Given Names.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: This morning I met a young woman who said: "I wonder, David, the most beautiful man's name there is in the world. Don't you?" And really, as to that, I was not prepared, offhand, to say that David is a good name, but whether it is the most beautiful of all men's names I am not quite so sure. Mine happens to be JOSEPHINE. SCHENKEL, November 26.

The Mouse Trap and the Bat.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: Speaking metaphorically, Warsaw is the best place of choice in history. JOHN KNUDSEN. New York, November 28.

The Last Salute.

Cool men working on a neighboring ship saw the sailors on the ship in the harbor and said to their hands to their heads and stood in salute in the moment that elapsed before they were swallowed by the waves. A. J. DEBARTOLIS. New York, November 28.

Men's Given Names.